



## ***Internal Reviews***

### ***Performance Period October -December 2003***

## **Introduction**

The second year of implementation of Internal Reviews began in October 2003, with nineteen complexes reviewed in the second quarter (October-December 2003). The previous report (Performance Period July-September 2003) described preliminary results of the October reviews as well as the refinements initiated this school year.

Refinements implemented in the second quarter included:

- 1) Increased community participation in the majority of the Internal Reviews,
- 2) Assignment of State-level mentors for each of the cases reviewed, and implementation of Agreement Check methodology to provide field-based quality controls for reviewer performance and consistency of ratings. As described in last quarter's report, this methodology replaced the Verification Check system formerly used.
- 3) Implementation of a "case-judge" process for any cases where there is a lack of agreement between lead reviewer and mentor. The case judge process was exercised for one case reviewed in the quarter. The case judge, the Performance Manager for CAMHD, upheld the mentor's determination.
- 4) Improved training targeted at impacting the skills of participants in critical discernment and objectivity in conducting reviews,
- 5) Distribution of guidelines in writing case narratives and protocol refinements
- 6) Clarification of improvement/corrective action plans and review sampling methodology
- 7) Strengthened Internal Review debriefing process,
- 8) Involvement of Early Intervention Section personnel in focus groups, and
- 9) Further integration of Internal Review data into the Statewide Quality Assurance process.

This report will review the results of Complex Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter, and evaluate the impact of refinements on the process.

## **Findings**

Internal Reviews were conducted in the second quarter for 19 complexes. The overall performance goal for the State is that each complex will achieve 85% or better system performance on their Internal Reviews. In the second quarter, 95% of complexes achieved that goal. One complex (Campbell) did not meet the performance target for system performance, as system performance was found to be 84% acceptable. Sixteen or 84% of the complexes met the performance goal for child status. Overall, as seen in Table 1, 94% of youth reviewed had acceptable child status, and statewide, the system was performing well for 95% of youth reviewed. Waianae and Lanai implemented Internal Reviews for the first time following completion of Service Testing conducted through the Felix Monitoring Project.

Below are the Statewide results for all Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter (October-December 2003):

STATE TOTAL n=284		
<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>90% (n=256)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>5% (n=13)</b>	<b>95% (n=269)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>4% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>1% (n=4)</b>	
<b>94% (n=267)</b>		

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

## Description of the Samples

There were a total of 284 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 2 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and early intervention. The sample size is determined by the number of schools in the complex in order to assure that students from each school are reviewed. All reviews are conducted using the Coordinated Services Review Protocol.

Table 2. Distribution of the Sample (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Central Kauai	4	4	4	1	13
Farrington	3	6	9	1	19
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	4	5	8	1	18
Nanakuli	4	3	4	1	12
Kahuku	4	3	5	1	13
Lanai	5	4	3	0	12
Pahoa	4	4	4	1	13
Waianae	5	5	10	1	21
Konawaena	4	4	4	1	13
Roosevelt	4	6	7	1	18
Waialua	4	4	4	1	13
Campbell	5	4	9	1	19
Kohala	5	4	3	1	13
Castle	6	4	10	1	21
East Kauai	5	3	4	1	13
Kea'au	4	4	4	1	13
Aiea	4	3	5	1	13
Kalani	3	2	7	1	13
King Kekaulike	4	4	5	1	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>284</b>

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 3. Sampling is based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed (N=284), 19% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Approximately 50% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are case managed by the schools, 24% are IDEA non-Felix students, and 6% were receiving Early Intervention Services.

Table 3. Description of the Sample (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

	<b>CAMHD Felix</b>	<b>IDEA / 504 Felix</b>	<b>IDEA Non-Felix</b>	<b>Early Intervention</b>	<b>2nd Quarter</b>
Central Kauai	3	5	4	1	<b>13</b>
Farrington	4	10	4	1	<b>19</b>
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	3	10	4	1	<b>18</b>
Nanakuli	3	4	4	1	<b>12</b>
Kahuku	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Lanai	1	8	3	0	<b>12</b>
Pahoa	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Waianae	3	13	4	1	<b>21</b>
Konawaena	3	7	2	1	<b>13</b>
Roosevelt	3	10	4	1	<b>18</b>
Waialua	1	8	3	1	<b>13</b>
Campbell	3	9	6	1	<b>19</b>
Kohala	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Castle	4	10	6	1	<b>21</b>
East Kauai	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Kea'au	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Aiea	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Kalani	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
King Kekaulike	3	6	4	1	<b>14</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>284</b>

Table 4 displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 284 youth reviewed represented 13 out of the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentages of youth were in the categories Specific Learning Disability (20%) and Emotional Disturbance (19.7%). Other Health Impairments (12%) and Mental Retardation (11%) were the next most frequent. All of the eligibility categories, except for Deaf/Blindness, were represented in the reviews.

Table 4. Disability Categories (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

	Central Kauai	Farrington	Hilo/ Laupahoehoe	Nanakuli	Kahuku	Lanai	Pahoa	Waianae	Konawaena	Roosevelt	Waialua	Campbell	Kohala	Castle	East Kauai	Kea'au	Aiea	Kalani	King Kekaulike	Total
Autism	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	2		1	1	1	1	1		16
Deaf/Blindness																				0
Deafness			1																	1
Developmental Delay		2	1	1	1			1	1	2		1	2	1	1	1	1			16
Emotional Disturbance	2	5	4	3	3	2	2	7	3	2	3	4	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	56
Hearing Impairment			1	1	1		1	1						1	1			1		8
Mental Retardation	2	1	2	2	2		1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	31
Multiple Disabilities							1							1	1			1		4
Orthopedic Impairment															1				1	2
Other Health Impairments	1	4	1	1	2	3	2	1	1		2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	34
Specific Learning Disability	4	2	4	1	1	3	3	5	4	8	3	4	2	3		3	1	3	3	57
Speech/Language Impairment								1		1		1		1			1			5
Traumatic Brain Injury				1		1								1						3
Visual Impairment	1	1				1							1	2						6
504 Felix	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	27
IDEA, Early Intervention	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>284</b>

## Participants

A total of 567 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and University of Hawaii (UH) personnel, and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. The participants represented 29 different role groups. The largest group represented was Special Education Teachers (92), followed by School Counselors (70), Resource Teachers (69) and Student Service Coordinators (43). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participate in multiple complex reviews.

Table 5. Internal Review Participants (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

	Central Kauai	Farrington	Hilo/ Laupahoehoe	Nanakuli	Kahuku	Lanai	Pahoa	Waianae	Konawaena	Roosevelt	Waialua	Campbell	Kohala	Castle	East Kauai	Kea'au	Aiea	Kalani	King Kekaulike	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	0	12	0	1	2	2	0	8	2	9	5	5	0	7	0	2	8	7	0	70
Educational Assistant	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Principal	0	2	5	0	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	2	0	22
Vice Principal	0	5	1	0	1	2	1	6	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	25
Psychological Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
DOE Contracted Mentors	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	25
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	4	3	5	3	4	2	7	0	3	9	6	2	5	1	4	5	0	2	4	69
SBBH Therapist, Manager	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	3	15
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	9
Special Education Department Chair	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	0	6	2	4	1	1	1	9	2	9	5	23	0	9	0	5	7	1	7	92
Speech Language Pathologist	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Student Services Coordinator	0	5	2	1	4	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	3	4	0	1	1	6	8	43
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition)	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	13	2	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	4	2	0	32
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	10
School Assessment Liaison	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Librarian, Reading Specialist	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Autism Consultant	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	28
Social Worker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	2	10
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	18
Branch Chief, Clinical Director	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	13
Family Support Worker, FGC	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	13
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	1	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	14
Mental Health Supervisor	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Public Health Nurse	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	9
Early Intervention Personnel	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	18
<b>2nd Quarter Total Participants</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>567</b>

## Review Outcomes and Trends

Examination of child status and system performance indicators demonstrates trends among the complexes as well as findings that are complex-specific. Of the nineteen complexes reviewed, all but one complex (Campbell Complex) performed at an acceptable level for system performance. Campbell was only 1% below the performance threshold. Most complexes were found to be doing well across both child status and system performance indicators.

The child status and system performance results for the second quarter (October-December 2003) Internal Reviews are displayed below:

Table 6. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance (Second Quarter, FY 2004)

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2003-2004	System Performance SY 2003-2004
Central Kauai	October 13-15, 17, 2003	13	100%	100%
Farrington	October 14-24, 2003	19	100%	100%
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	October 20-24, 2003	18	89%	94%
Nanakuli	October 20-24, 2003	12	83%	92%
Kahuku	October 27-30, 2003	13	100%	100%
Lanai	October 27-31, 2003	12	100%	100%
Pahoa	October 27-31, 2003	13	85%	92%
Waianae	October 27-31, 2003	21	91%	86%
Konawaena	November 3-7, 2003	13	100%	100%
Roosevelt	November 3-7, 2003	18	100%	100%
Waialua	November 3-7, 2003	13	100%	85%
Campbell	November 14-21, 2003	19	79%	84%
Kohala	November 17-21, 2003	13	100%	100%
Castle	December 1-5, 2003	21	95%	100%
East Kauai	December 1-5, 2003	13	100%	92%
Kea'au	December 1-5, 2003	13	77%	92%
Aiea	December 8-12, 2003	13	100%	92%
Kalani	December 8-12, 2003	13	100%	100%
King Kekaulike	December 8-12, 2003	14	93%	93%

### Child Status Concerns

Overall Child status was a concern in three of the nineteen complexes [Nanakuli (83%), Campbell (79%), and Kea'au (77%)]. Data for these complexes indicate that child status indicators for Learning Progress, Responsible Behavior, and Emotional Well-Being were unacceptable for all three complexes. Safety was a concern for several youth in the Nanakuli sample. Stability of educational or living situation was a concern for 21% of the youth reviewed in the Campbell complex, and 31% of those reviewed in Kea'au. Caregiver functioning was unacceptable for several youth in the Campbell Complex and a third of those reviewed in the Nanakuli Complex. Targeted strategies for impacting child status in these communities are warranted. Across indicators of system performance, the complexes generally struggled with identifying focal concerns in assessments, providing functional assessments that can be used for team planning, and providing contingency plans. In terms of "finding what works" in order to achieve

positive results in many of the cases reviewed, the complexes had problems impacting the following areas: the focal situation for youth, academic achievement, risk reduction, and effective problem solving. Each of the complexes has developed an improvement plan that will be monitored for implementation and results.

### ***Statewide Trends***

Content analyses of Internal Review Reports reveal positive statewide trends and patterns demonstrating viable local service systems. Reviews identified primary caregivers more involved as team members, and high parent satisfaction in most areas. Teams were found to have extensive knowledge of students and families, and where effective results were evident for youth, there was improved communication among team members. Students generally were making overall progress with attendance, academic performance and behavior. In many cases, transitions were improved through more proactive planning.

Concerns identified by review teams were addressed in Complex Action Plans. Among the areas for improvement identified by teams were issues related to IEPs, including a lack of reflection of needs in IEPs resulting in goals not fully addressing instructional or behavioral strategies needed to benefit youth. Review teams found “generic” IEPs in some instances that were not written at the level of specificity desired to guide team interventions. Also identified as a concern in many areas were outdated psychological assessments. Low reading levels were found in many of the cases, as well as a need for greater involvement and understanding of students from regular education teachers. Review teams did not see evidence of appropriate or available extra-curricular activities for youth. Identification of these concerns are seen as an opportunity for complexes to develop accountable strategies for change.

## **State-level Feedback on Internal Review Reports**

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review findings and data. The overall goal is to imbed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty days following the conclusion of the Internal Review, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty days. To date, responses have been sent for all complexes reviewed in October. Complexes reviewed in November and December have all completed and submitted their reports. Feedback to those reports are being prepared. The feedback were delayed due to staffing issues including retirements and management of the multiple tasks associated with monitoring in both Departments.

Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the report and the review process, and the quality of the improvement plan. The plan itself can be accepted, accepted with refinements recommended, or commented on with a request for a revised plan. For the complex reports reviewed to date, 100% have had their plans accepted. Last school year only 27% of plans were accepted. Strengthened guidelines for the reports have had an impact, and have resulted in increased quality of the plans.

## Summary

Based on the initial scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter, the state is demonstrating that the vast majority of youth with special needs continue to consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. Moreover, most youth are doing well across indicators of child well-being. Six of the eight complexes implemented corrective action plans over the past year. Their performance in October's Internal Reviews indicate improvement strategies have been successful. Waianae and Lanai complexes have transitioned from Service Testing conducted by the Courts, to internally driven performance monitoring.

The Internal Review Process continues to be a viable and important methodology for the state in continuing the substantive gains made for youth over the past decade. The State's integrated accountability system remains critical to the commitment for sustainable continuous improvements and outcomes for youth and their families. Because of the value of Internal Reviews in realizing and maintaining positive results, the Departments have internalized these processes into their performance management systems. The State remains committed to continued implementation of Internal Reviews as a key component of its quality assurance system for children and youth with special needs and their families.

## Complex Data

The following section provides a "profile" of each complex reviewed over the second quarters of fiscal year 2004 (October-December 2003). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients in out of state treatment settings, in out of home treatment, with service delivery gaps, with complaints, and who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include number of service gaps, percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, number of hearing requests, and percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data related to suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

## Central Kauai October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	26	0%
Out of Home	9	26	35%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	26	0%
Complaints	1	26	2%
CSP timelines	23	26	88%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100**	0	1	1	97.5**

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4086	113	401	61	4.96	3.61	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

\*\* December

## Farrington October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=19

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=19)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=19)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	12	0%
Out of Home	1	12	8%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	12	0%
Complaints	0	12	0%
CSP timelines	12	12	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
4	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	98.1	2	1	1	92.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	8273	107	781	42	3.77	2.63	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Hilo/Laupahoehoe October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>83% (n=15)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>11% (n=2)</b>	<b>94%</b> <b>(n=17)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**89%**  
**(n=16)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	40	3%
Out of Home	17	40	43%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	40	0%
Complaints	1	40	3%
CSP timelines	33	40	83%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2.9	0.0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
3	100	0	1	0	89.4

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4735	27	702	18	3.83	4.46	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Nanakuli October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>83.3% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8.3% (n=1)</b>	<b>92% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>8.3% (n=1)</b>	

**83%  
(n=10)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	20	0%
Out of Home	7	20	35%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	20	0%
Complaints	1	20	5%
CSP timelines	20	20	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100	0	1	1	97.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2874	84	445	58	3.77	4.62	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kahuku October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=1)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	19	5%
Out of Home	1	19	5%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	19	0%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP timelines	16	17	94%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	95	0	0	1	87.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3756	17	462	0	0.00	0.00	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Lanai October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=1)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	4	0%
Out of Home	1	4	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	4	0%
Complaints	0	4	0%
CSP timelines	4	4	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	100

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	636	2	146	5	8.39	16.73	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Pahoa October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>77% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>92%</b> <b>(n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**85%**  
**(n=11)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	29	0%
Out of Home	15	29	52%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	29	0%
Complaints	0	29	0%
CSP timelines	16	29	55%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2.5	0.5	20%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	1	1	82.9

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2016	56	350	42	3.57	5.02	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waianae October 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=21

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=18)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>86% (n=18)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>9% (n=2)</b>	

**91%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	36	0%
Out of Home	10	36	28%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	36	0%
Complaints	0	36	0%
CSP timelines	36	36	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
3	100	1	0	0	85.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6563	208	1151	119	2.69	3.83	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Konawaena November 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	18	0%
Out of Home	12	18	67%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	18	0%
Complaints	0	18	0%
CSP timelines	11	18	61%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.2	0.0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	1	90.9

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2312	124	295	44	2.43	2.37	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Roosevelt November 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=18)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=18)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	17	6%
Out of Home	5	17	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	17	0%
Complaints	0	17	0%
CSP timelines	14	17	82%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	97	0	1	7	96.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6524	83	593	16	1.93	1.29	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waialua November 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>85% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>85% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	5	0%
Out of Home	1	5	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	5	0%
Complaints	0	5	0%
CSP timelines	4	5	80%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	81.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	1519	6	243	5	4.38	5.58	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Campbell November 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=19

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>63% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>21% (n=4)</b>	<b>84% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>16% (n=3)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

79%  
(n=15)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	20	0%
Out of Home	7	20	35%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	20	0%
Complaints	0	20	0%
CSP timelines	17	20	85%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
4	100	1	1	2	87.5

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	7635	130	924	34	1.90	1.75	3.27

\* State Average = 87% Regular Education and 13% Special Education

## Kohala November 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	10	0%
Out of Home	3	10	30%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	10	0%
Complaints	0	10	0%
CSP timelines	7	10	70%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.3	0.4	33%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	2	96.2

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	959	14	148	9	3.52	4.30	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Castle December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=21

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b>  + Child + System Performance  <b>95% (n=20)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b>  - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=21)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b>  + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b>  - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	
<b>95% (n=20)</b>		

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	29	3%
Out of Home	1	29	3%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	29	0%
Complaints	0	29	0%
CSP timelines	22	27	81%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
5	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	98.4	0	1	5	90.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6088	134	919	90	3.78	4.49	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## East Kauai December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	31	0%
Out of Home	9	31	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	31	0%
Complaints	0	31	0%
CSP timelines	29	31	94%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	1	0	96.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3349	84	475	54	3.89	4.30	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kea'au December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>77% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>92%</b> <b>(n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	

77%  
(n=10)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	54	0%
Out of Home	23	54	43%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	54	0%
Complaints	0	54	0%
CSP timelines	29	54	54%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2.5	0.5	20%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	1	0	88.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2761	166	466	158	4.69	6.37	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Aiea December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	10	0%
Out of Home	3	10	30%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	10	0%
Complaints	0	10	0%
CSP timelines	10	10	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	3	92.8

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4687	37	472	10	2.41	1.81	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kalani December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	14	0%
Out of Home	2	14	14%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	14	0%
Complaints	0	14	0%
CSP timelines	10	14	71%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	97.6	0	1	0	97.4

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4243	50	455	22	3.66	2.94	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## King Kekaulike December 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**93%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	34	0%
Out of Home	10	34	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	34	0%
Complaints	0	34	0%
CSP timelines	29	34	85%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
10	91.7	0	0	12	83.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	03-04 SY Actual Enrollment	03-04 SY *State Average	02-03 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4505	67	672	47	4.00	4.69	3.27

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education